

Journal of the American Society of Professional Graphologists

Welcome to the Journal: A Letter from the President

Thea Stein Lewinson

The Status and Future of Scientific Graphology

Joanna Fancy

Printscript Analysis

Daniel S. Anthony

Evaluation of the Left-handed Writer

Patricia Siegel

Alcoholism and Handwriting

Thea Stein Lewinson

The Preconscious in Handwriting

Marc J. Seifer

**Volume One
Fall 1989**

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL GRAPHOLOGISTS

Volume 1: 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

- 3 Welcome to the Journal
- 7 Introduction
- 9 The Status and Future of Scientific Graphology
Joanna Fancy
- 19 Chronological Representative Bibliography of Articles
Validating Graphology
- 27 Printscript Analysis
Daniel S. Anthony
- 41 Evaluation of the Left-handed Writer
Patricia Siegel
- 47 Alcoholism and Handwriting
Thea Stein Lewinson
- 63 The Preconscious in Handwriting
Marc J. Seifer
- 81 Subscription Blank

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL GRAPHOLOGISTS

OFFICERS

President: Thea Stein Lewinson
Vice President: Philippe Beuzelin
Treasurer: Sarah L. Garroway, D.Sc. (HON.)
Corresponding Secretary: Edith Eisenberg
Newsletter Editor: Joanna Fancy

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Alan Levine, M.D.
Particia Siegel
Lois Vaisman

EDITOR

Marc J. Seifer, Ph.D.

LEGAL ADVISOR

Eugene Davison, Esquire

HONORARY MEMBER

Joseph Zubin, Ph.D.

ADDITIONAL FOUNDING MEMBERS

Daniel Anthony	Peggy Kahn	Lucia Newman
Janice Groele	Renata Propper	Thelma Seifer

PURPOSE OF THE JOURNAL

1. To present theoretical and research papers in scientific graphology according to traditional academic standards.
2. To create a forum for helping graphology gain a wider academic and professional audience in America.
3. To interface with the international professional graphological community.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Manuscript inquiries should be addressed to Marc Seifer, Editor, Box 32, Kingston, RI 02881. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and memberships should be addressed to Thea Stein Lewinson, 9109 North Branch Drive, Bethesda, MD 20817.

© Copyright 1989. All rights reserved.
American Society For Professional Graphologists

Welcome and Best Wishes to the New Journal of the
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL
GRAPHOLOGISTS

This publication is going to be the first journal of scientific graphology in the United States. It is projected to contain not only articles of handwriting analysis of the highest quality, but also eventually to branch out into other related fields of psychology, e.g., relationship to other test methods, case histories in collaboration with psychotherapists, varied applications of handwriting analysis in business and professional life, the study of foreign alphabets and their usefulness in handwriting work, studies of personalities in history and politics, and possibly occasional articles by well recognized identification experts, etc., etc. Looking at the European scientific graphological journals, one realizes how wide and varied the field can be.

It may be interesting to show here the various handwritings of leading graphologists who established the scientific basis of handwriting analysis. They were collected at a very important event, if not perhaps the most important, because most all of the founders of graphology came together for the first time, and it was perhaps the only time. It was by no means peaceful. Without going into details, many controversies developed. Outstanding was the animosity between Klages and Pulver.

I, as a budding young graphologist trying to establish my work in America and having a few publications to my name, took it all in. It was most exciting, and I learned a lot from the conversations with those leading people and their viewpoints. All these representatives though stressed the "Science of the Expressive Movement" as the basis of handwriting analysis, the multifariousness of graphic indicators and the "Gestalt" of the script. With most of these people, I became friends and stayed in constant contact with them. However, by now, most of them are not alive anymore.

Our purpose here, in this journal, should be to acquaint the scientific community and the public in America with the various aspects and possibilities which the field of scientific handwriting analysis has to offer, and that this type of work must be distinguished clearly from the numerous unscientific endeavors in the handwriting field. We should strive to reach the high level and recognition which the European graphological journals, some of them over 50 years old, have obtained. This is not an easy task, but it can be done. Dedication, integrity and hard work are the ingredients for reaching goals like these.

We will face many difficulties. One of them will be to make a very complex new subject understandable to people who had never thought about the intricacies of handwriting analysis and its possible usefulness. Another difficulty could be the lacking basic graphological literature in the English language. Translations are needed, and they are not easy. We also face a problem to make our Society and

its work known to the graphological community in Europe. Collaboration could be fruitful for all participants concerned. Some of the European journals publish already English summaries at the end of their articles. And it may be desirable for us to publish German and French summaries of the articles in our journal. But this would present again more difficulties and more work.

Right now, however, we are in need of opportunities for research work. Psychologists, physicians and other individuals who are initiating research projects and want to apply a psycho-diagnostic technique to test the subjects involved, could perhaps think of handwriting analysis as a useful tool. This could be helpful for the researchers as well as possibly presenting an additional support to proving the validity of handwriting analysis. These are only some suggestions. Neither Rome was built in one day, nor can we expect immediate complete success for our efforts.

We have to realize that we are at the beginning of a long and hard trail. The European graphologists have made their way and have reached almost complete recognition as a scientific method in business, industry and many universities. We may have to overcome some more obstacles which need not be discussed at this time. Our measurements and evaluations have proven very correct in many instances already here, as our research has proven. And in the Land of Opportunities, where even psychoanalysis has found eventual recognition, why should not scientific handwriting analysis find its proper recognition and application?

Right now, we are optimistic and answer the above question with "yes." The *Journal* should be an important step towards our goals, and we wish it all the success and recognition which the courageous efforts of its editor deserve.

Thea Stein Lewinson
President
January 1989

und freund lichen Offenta.
 fröhlich Thea Stein Lewinson

Max Pulver

A mon ami M. Hans Jacoby
 hommage reconnaissant

Wolff.

J. Crepieux-Jamin

Tannstr. 22. München

freundl. sende
 Roda Wieser

Ihr Prof. W. Preyer

Klara Roman-Goldzieher

Anja Mendelssohn

Figure 1. The following names are listed: Max Pulver, Otto Fanta, editor of the journal "Die Schrift", Thea Stein Lewinson, Hans Jacoby, Ludwig Klages, J. Crepieux-Jamin, Roda Wieser, Prof. W. Preyer, Klara Roman-Goldzieher, Anja Mendelssohn. Werner Wolff was also there, but his signature does not appear here (from *SELF-KNOWLEDGE THROUGH HANDWRITING*, by H.J. Jacoby, J.M. Dent & Sons, London, 1941).

INTRODUCTION

The first issue of the *Journal* represents over 100 years of combined experience by the authors. The president of the Society, Thea Stein Lewinson, has been a leader in the field ever since her landmark text on objectively measuring rhythm in handwriting, *Handwriting Analysis*, was published in 1942. Thea's paper on the handwriting of alcoholics breaks new ground for scientific graphology for it not only suggests a methodology for the longitudinal study of alcoholics, but it also describes primary and secondary characteristics common to their personalities.

Three of the authors, Patricia Siegel, Joanna Fancy and Marc Seifer, were students of Daniel S. Anthony at the New School For Social Research in New York City. One of Dan's most important works, *The Graphological Psychogram*, is still the mainstay of the graphology program at the New School even though Dan has moved to Florida. This remarkable treatise, which greatly expands the work of his mentor, Klara Roman, provides a double-edged measuring tool for studying 40 graphological variables in both a psychological and an objective numerical way. It is, perhaps, the best tool that the graphologist has for analyzing handwriting in a way that can be statistically analyzed for scientific experiments.

Dan's article on printscript explores an area in the field neglected by other writers. As Dan points out, with this coming age of computers, more and more writers appear to be adopting a printscript style, perhaps, in part, to compete with the aesthetics of the typescripted page. Clearly, a new understanding of this mode of handwriting is becoming more of a necessity for the modern-day graphologist.

Patricia Siegel, along with Lois Vaisman, another member of the Society, has taken over Dan's classes at the New School. One of Pat's specialties is the psychoneurological study of the left-handed writer. The enclosed paper delineates a number of graphic features that are often misinterpreted because the analyst is unaware of the mechanical problems the lefty has in adapting to the handwriting style of the right-handed world.

Joanna Fancy's article on the status and the future of scientific graphology, explores the recurring problems the graphologist has in getting the field accepted in a scientific way. In a recent letter to the editor in the *American Psychologist* on this very same topic for the field of psychology as a whole, and for behaviorism in particular, Pfaus, et al. (1988) call for psychology to begin to "adopt... a formal system for notating movement... in the study of behavior because it allows the physical properties of behavior to be stated objectively in a readily communicable form" (pp. 821-822). Critical of both the mind psychologists for limiting their discussion to subjective criteria, and the strict behaviorists for limiting their definition of behavior to the organism's impact or lack thereof on the environment, Pfaus, et al., suggest that a detailed taxonomy of specific movements "reveal[s] organizing principles of behavior that were previously unrecognized" (pp. 821-822).^{*} Although the authors here are to some extent talking about such topics as instincts and species specific behaviors (neglected by the strict behaviorists), they are also discussing the process of coordination and the neurological basis of overt behavior. Certainly the graphologist seeks to benefit should this viewpoint gain a wider audience.

Ironically, as this issue is going to press, there is a bill in the congress of the state that I am living in, Rhode Island, which is attempting to ban the use of graphology for personnel selection. Ostensibly, the argument is that (1) there is no scientific basis to handwriting analysis, and (2) even if there were, the misuse of this diagnostic tool could potentially injure the rights of persons seeking employment. The second argument, in a sense, has less to do with handwriting analysis, than it has to do with the competence of the diagnostician, and the ethics involved in writing up any kind of analyses, be they by personnel agents, managers, psychologists or graphologists. Thus, only the first issue specifically relates to graphology. As Joanna's article suggests, and as this bill before the state legislature impels us, we as a group of social scientists, must begin to increase the amount of controlled studies validating our field.

There is already a substantial list of published studies achieving this end spanning nearly a century of research in Europe and here in America. Some have been performed by members of this organization, and others have been performed by the major textbook writers in the field (see validation bibliography which follows the opening article). Nevertheless, this is only a beginning. Further, not many individuals are aware of these studies. As our legal advisor Eugene Davidson said at our April 1989 meeting, we must continue to "plant seeds," that is, to reach out to a wider professional audience and seek publishing outlets in other fields such as medicine, neuropsychology, psychology, and law.

The first draft of the last article on the preconscious in handwriting was written by myself while enrolled in a Masters program at the University of Chicago in 1972. I had just left Dan's courses at the New School and was studying theories of personality and also psychoanalysis with Freud's student, the brilliant analyst Bruno Bettelheim. Although Bettelheim was not a graphologist, and would not allow me to discuss graphology for my class presentation, he was amenable to the subject. Attempting to replicate as well as he could the atmosphere of Freud's original teachings, Bettelheim said that the father of psychoanalysis was opposed to projective techniques, such as graphology and the Rorschach, because they were "short-cuts" to the "joint effort voyage of discovery" that the patient and analyst makes as they explore the workings of the patient's mind.

I thought it ironic, however, that Dr. Bettelheim would spend most of the class time with his eyes closed, picking out nuances, resistances and so on, in the *voices* of his students as he analyzed us as if we were his patients in much the same way that the graphologist analyzes a handwriting. On a walk home from class one day, Dr. Bettelheim said to me that graphology, beyond its rudimentary points, like music or great art, cannot be taught; and in that way, he complimented the field, even though he deprived the class of what I thought to be, an exciting lesson.

Marc J. Seifer
Editor

*Pfaus, J., Blackburn, J., Harpur, T., MacDonald, M., Mana, M., & Jacobs, W. Has Psychology Ever Been a Science of Behavior? A Comment on Skinner. *American Psychologist*, October, 1988, pp. 821-822.